IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EMC OUTDOOR, LLC : CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant :

NO. 17-5172

v.

:

JENNIFER STUART, et al. :

Defendants/Counterclaim Plaintiffs :

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31th day of March 2021, upon consideration of Defendants' *motion for summary judgment*, [ECF 107], Plaintiff's ("EMC") response in opposition thereto, [ECF 110], and Defendants' reply, [ECF 113], it is hereby **ORDERED** that, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum opinion, Defendants' motion is **GRANTED**, *in part*, and **DENIED**, *in part*, as follows:

- Defendants' motion is GRANTED, as to Count II of EMC's amended complaint
 (DTSA Misappropriation of Trade Secrets), against Defendant Jennifer Stuart
 ("Stuart") entirely, and against Defendant Grandesign, Inc. ("Grandesign"), in part,
 only to the extent that any such claims are based on alleged trade secrets that
 Grandesign would have acquired from Stuart;
- Defendants' motion is GRANTED, as to Count III of EMC's amended complaint,
 (PUTSA Misappropriation of Trade Secrets) against Stuart entirely, and against
 Grandesign, *in part*, only to the extent that any such claims are based on alleged
 trade secrets that Grandesign would have acquired *from Stuart*;
- Defendants' motion is GRANTED, as to Count IV of EMC's amended complaint,
 (Breach of Contract), Count VI of EMC's amended complaint (Breach of Fiduciary
 Duty), and Count VIII of EMC's amended complaint (Defamation);

- Defendants' motion is GRANTED, as to Count XI of EMC's amended complaint,
 (Unjust Enrichment) against Grandesign *only*; and
- Defendants' motion is **DENIED**, with respect to all other claims.¹

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro
NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO
Judge, United States District Court

The counts of EMC's amended complaint that remain viable at this time are: Count I; Count II against Defendant Mary Jo Pittera, and against Grandesign to the extent that any such claims are based on alleged trade secrets that Grandesign acquired *from Mary Jo Pittera*; Count III against Defendant Mary Jo Pittera, and against Grandesign to the extent that any such claims are based on alleged trade secrets that Grandesign acquired *from Mary Jo Pittera*; Count V; Count VIII; Count IX; Count XI against Defendants Stuart and Mary Jo Pittera *only*; and Count XII.